



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,977	06/29/2001	Michael Joscph Calderaro	AUS9-2001-0235-US1	9300

40412 7590 10/16/2006
IBM CORPORATION- AUSTIN (JVL)
C/O VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN
PO BOX 90609
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609

EXAMINER

CHOI, PETER H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,977

Applicant(s)

CALDERARO ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Choi

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a **FINAL** office action upon examination of application number 09/895,977. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed August 10, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Walker is not concerned with, and does not address the issue of analyzing attrition risk on an individual basis for individual employees, specifically, by not teaching or suggesting the step of "analyzing attrition risk for each of the selected employees using the risk planning factor data and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner asserts that Walker Information (along with The Hudson Institute) administered a survey to a plurality of employees, whose individual results have been tallied and analyzed before being

Art Unit: 3623

aggregated together for presentation in the 1999 Walker report. Specifically, the survey collects data from employees regarding their loyalty to their employers (i.e., their intent to stay with their employer), thus analyzing attrition risk for each of the survey participants (the “selected” employees) on an individual basis. The Examiner further asserts that the Walker report is an aggregate representation of the survey results that reflects the collective response of survey participants, whose responses were individually considered.

Applicant argues that neither Paizis nor walker teaches or suggests “calculating a flight risk” for each individual employee.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner points out that even though the terms “calculating” and “calculated” exist in the claim language, there is no evidence that anything is actually “calculated” (i.e., there is no numerical consideration that would lead to a calculation or computation); therefore, this limitation has been taken at its broadest reasonable interpretation, and has been regarded as being analogous to an evaluation of flight risk. As presented above, the Examiner further asserts that the Walker report is an aggregate representation of the survey results that reflects the collective response of survey participants, whose responses were individually considered, and thus “calculates” (i.e., evaluates and considers) the flight risk for each employee on an individual basis.

Art Unit: 3623

Applicant argues that neither Paizis nor Walker teaches or suggests “calculating a flight risk” or “assigning a risk quadrant” for each individual employee.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As seen on page 1 of the 1999 Walker reference, employees have been grouped into one of four employee groups, which the Examiner has interpreted to be “risk quadrants” (Accessible, Truly Loyal, Trapped, High Risk). The Examiner asserts that the placing of each employee into one of said employee groups is based on their “flight risk”, as survey results are used to predict employee loyalty to their employees, loyalty being characterized as intent to stay (essentially measuring employee attrition and turnover). The Examiner also asserts that each employee is placed into one of the four employee groups, and pages 1-2 of the 1999 Walker reference is a summary of the methodology of the development of the four employee groups.

Applicant argues that neither Paizis nor Walker discloses “retrieving motivators and inhibitors included with risk planning factor data for a particular employee, and then using those motivators and inhibitors to calculate a flight risk for that particular employee”.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner asserts information collected in surveys conducted by Walker, which include employee belief in availability of job opportunities existing outside their organization, whether the organization shows

Art Unit: 3623

genuine concern for its employees, whether the company provides family-friendly benefits, whether the company cares about developing employees for the long term, whether the company provides fair treatment, fair pay, and fair policies, whether the organization trusts its employees, whether employees are given the freedom to make their own decisions at work, whether employees feel encouraged to try new ways of doing things at work, whether supervisors pay attention to how people feel, fairness at work, whether the company cares and is concerned for employees, employee satisfaction with day to day activities, company trust in employees, and intangible or “soft” aspects of corporate culture including attention from management and the confidence that their organization would help in time of need constitute both inhibitors and motivators (i.e., an employee who feels that their employer is fair would find it to be motivating, whereas an employee who feels that their employer is unfair would find it to be an inhibitor). Walker also cites employee feelings, like perceptions of limited career advancement opportunities, or a spouse’s relocation or a return to school, which may also constitute inhibitors and/or motivators [Pages 2-4 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report].

The Examiner also asserts that the motivators and inhibitors for each individual employee are taken into consideration by Walker when evaluating individual employee loyalty for placement into a “risk quadrant” (**likelihood of employees who are truly loyal {want to be there and expect to stay at least two years}, accessible {want to be there, but do not intend to stay}, trapped {don’t want to be there, but intend to be there}, and high risk {don’t want to be with the organization and don’t intend to stay; intent to stay is measured for each participant in the survey, and then used**

Art Unit: 3623

to place said participant into one of the four employee groups based on predicted loyalty to their employer} [Pages 1-3 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report].

As pointed out above, even though the terms "calculating" and "calculated" exist in the claim language, there is no evidence that anything is actually "calculated" (i.e., there is no numerical consideration that would lead to a calculation or computation); therefore, this limitation has been taken at its broadest reasonable interpretation, and has been regarded as being analogous to an evaluation of flight risk. As presented above, the Examiner further asserts that the Walker report is an aggregate representation of the survey results that reflects the collective response of survey participants, whose responses were individually considered, and thus "calculates" the flight risk for each employee on an individual basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paizis (U.S Patent #6,338,042) in view of "The 1999 U.S National Employee

Art Unit: 3623

Relationship Benchmark Report" by the Walker Information Global Network (herein after referred to as Walker).

As per claim 1, Paizis teaches a computer-implemented method for analyzing attrition risk for employees, said method comprising:

(a) receiving planning factor data (**employee data from performance evaluations such as employee competency and contributions**) from a user, the planning factor data corresponding to one or more selected employees (**using performance evaluations of a group of individuals who have substantially the same role in an organization**) [Figures 5A, 5B and 5C, Column 4, lines 11-12, Column 5, lines 34-48, Claims 1 and 6];

(b) storing the planning factor data in employee profile data areas (**current status section 502**), wherein each employee profile data area corresponds to one of the selected employees **{each row represents a different employee}** [Figures 5A, 5B and 5C]; and

(c) retrieving actual employment data (**current salary and names of employees**) for each of the selected employees in the employee profile data areas (**current status section 502**) [Column 9, lines 19-21, Figures 5A, 5B and 5C].

The planning factor data taught by Paizis is based on employee performance evaluations and does not focus on the risk of employee attrition. However, Walker teaches data (survey results) of employees pertaining to employee satisfaction with their workplace and their intent to stay with their employer (i.e., likelihood of employee

Art Unit: 3623

attrition) that further reveals statistical breakdowns of employee loyalty, and their likelihood of staying with the company. Furthermore, Walker discusses the results of employees participating in the survey (thus, each participant's responses were individually collected, stored, and analyzed) [Pages 2-4 of the Walker 1999 U.S Report].

Paizis is directed towards considering employee worth in determining employee compensation (which impacts employee retention). Walker is directed towards an analogous art of studying employee relationships with their employer and its impact on loyalty and commitment (leading to employee retention); thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Paizis to include data pertaining to the risk of employee attrition in order to allow companies to take into consideration the factors impacting employee loyalty and commitment, which may lead to modifications to company policy and procedures in order to foster a greater sense of loyalty and commitment from employees, and establishing greater levels of fairness, trust, care, and concern from employers, leading to increased levels of employee retention, loyalty, and commitment.

Although not explicitly taught by Paizis, Walker teaches:

(d) analyzing attrition risk **{determining levels of employee commitment and intent to stay, embodied by placement into one of four groups based on predicted loyalty to their employer}** for each of the selected employees using the risk

Art Unit: 3623

planning factor data **{survey results of employees pertaining to their commitment and loyalty to their employers and why they feel that way; using Walker's model-based survey methodology}** and the actual employment data, wherein the attrition risk is individually analyzed for each of the selected employees **{survey results, including attrition risk, are collected for each individual participant before they are consolidated }** [Pages 1-2 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Paizis to combine employee data with studies on employee loyalty and commitment, because the combination would enable the company to determine the attrition risk of employees and accordingly develop changes in company policy or procedures in order to improve employee loyalty and commitment, which may lead to a decrease in employee attrition.

As per claim 2, Paizis teaches the computer-implemented method as described in claim 1 further comprising:

(c) retrieving contribution data **(measuring levels of contribution of employees, where levels of contribution may include contributions to leadership, overall business results or goals; obtaining contribution scores, which reflect the overall perceived levels of contribution of individuals in a position)** included with the actual employment data corresponding to the selected **{each row represents a**

Art Unit: 3623

different employee} employees [Column 4, lines 33-35, 49-50, and 53-54, Column 5, lines 60-63, Claims 1, and 6].

Although not explicitly taught by Paizis, Walker teaches:

(a) retrieving motivators and inhibitors (**belief in availability of job opportunities existing outside their organization, the organization shows genuine concern for its employees, company provides family-friendly benefits, company cares about developing employees for the long term, fair treatment, fair pay, fair policies, organization trusting its employees, employees given the freedom to make their own decisions at work, employees feel encouraged to try new ways of doing things at work, supervisors paying attention to how people feel, fairness at work, care and concern for employees, satisfaction with day to day activities, trust in employees, intangible or “soft” aspects of corporate culture including attention from management and the confidence that their organization would help in time of need, perceptions of limited career advancement opportunities, need for a spouse’s relocation or a return to school)** {each of the listed factors may be either a motivator or an inhibitor, depending on the perception of an individual employee, i.e., an employee who feels that their employer is fair would find it to be a motivating factor, whereas an employee who feels that their employer is unfair would find it to be an inhibitor factor} included with the risk planning factor data {measuring intent to stay and predicting loyalty to their employer}

Art Unit: 3623

corresponding to the selected employees [Pages 2-4 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report];
and

(b) calculating **{the Walker report is an aggregate representation of the survey results that reflects the collective response of survey participants, whose responses were individually considered, and thus “calculates” (i.e., evaluates and considers) the flight risk for each employee on an individual basis}** a flight risk **(likelihood of employees who are truly loyal {want to be there and expect to stay at least two years}, accessible {want to be there, but do not intend to stay}, trapped {don’t want to be there, but intend to be there}, and high risk {don’t want to be with the organization and don’t intend to stay})** for each of the selected employees **{for each participant in the survey}** based on the motivators and inhibitors, wherein the flight risk is individually calculated for each of the selected employees **{intent to stay is measured for each participant in the survey, and then used to place said participant into one of the four employee groups based on predicted loyalty to their employer}** [Pages 1-3 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report {which also includes a breakdown by industry}].

As per element (d), Walker teaches the step of assigning a risk quadrant **(employee group)** from a plurality of risk quadrants to each of the selected employees **{for each participant in the survey}** based on the flight risk **(predicted loyalty to their employer)** corresponding to each employee [Page 1 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report].

Paizis is directed towards considering employee worth in determining employee compensation (which impacts employee retention). Walker is directed towards an analogous art of studying employee relationships with their employer and its impact on loyalty and commitment (leading to employee retention); thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Paizis and Walker to assign a risk quadrant to each employee based on a weighted score of their flight risk and contributions, because it would enable the company to cluster employees into groups of similar flight risk and contribution levels, leading to the "prioritizing" of employees who should be targeted for retention since certain combinations of flight risk and contributions are more desirable than others (i.e., high contribution, high flight risk vs. low contribution, high flight risk, etc.), thereby enhancing the ability to integrate competency measures, contribution levels, and market distribution data into compensation decisions, by using the comparison of relative rankings to determine a suggested level of compensation for each individual, which is a goal of Paizis [Column 2, lines 46-48, 55-58].

As per claim 3, although not explicitly taught by Paizis, Walker teaches the step of displaying a summary corresponding to each risk quadrant (**employee groups are labeled, Truly Loyal, Accessible, Trapped, and High Risk**) [Pages 1-2 of the Walker 1999 U.S Report].

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 4, Paizis teaches the computer-implemented method as described in claim 3 further comprising:

- (a) displaying a plurality of groupings (**rankings**) [Column 6, line 23];
- (b) receiving a risk quadrant selection and a grouping selection from the user (**selecting an employee to be analyzed to determine a need to modify their pay value data**) [Column 3, lines 1-2];
- (c) summarizing employee profile data assigned to the selected risk quadrant using the selected grouping creating a second summary (**generating a display including a representation of the suggested level of compensation for each individual in the group of individuals** {which can inherently be aggregated within each quadrant to provide a summary}) [Claim 1]; and
- (d) displaying the second summary (**generating a display including a representation of the suggested level of compensation for each individual in the group of individuals**) [Claim 1].

As per claim 5, Paizis teaches the computer-implemented method as described in claim 3 further comprising:

- (b) determining whether incentives are desired for one or more of the selected employees in the selected risk quadrant (**modifications to the target market pay for individuals**) [Column 7, lines 12-13, 16-26]; and

Art Unit: 3623

(c) modifying incentive data (**computing suggested target market pay or modified pay levels**) included in employee profile data areas corresponding to the one or more selected employees [Column 7, lines 16-50].

Paizis does not explicitly teach:

(a) selecting one of {the employees in one of} the risk quadrants [an inherent step that enables a determination to be made regarding a need to modify pay value data].

However, Paizis does teach the step of selecting individual employees in order to make a determination of modifying target market pay values [Column 3, lines 1-2]. Each employee belongs to one of the defined risk quadrants; thus, Paizis effectively teaches the step of selecting a risk quadrant, meeting the limitation of the claim.

As per claim 6, Paizis teaches the computer-implemented method as described in claim 5 further comprising:

(a) reassigning the risk quadrants (**after the changed target market pay information is obtained, revised rankings are displayed; re-ranking employees**) for one or more selected employees {**for each participant in the survey**} in response to the modified incentive data [Column 7, lines 24-26, Column 9, line 64 - Column 10, line 3, and Claim 8]; and

Art Unit: 3623

(b) displaying a second summary corresponding to each risk quadrant **(generating a display including a representation of the suggested level of compensation for each individual in the group of individuals {which can inherently be aggregated within each quadrant to provide a summary})** [Claim 1].

As per claim 7, Paizis teaches the computer-implemented method as described in claim 1 further comprising:

(b) displaying the identified employees to the user **(employee rankings are displayed in step 324 such that a user may review the rankings)** [Column 6, lines 23-24];

(c) determining whether to provide incentives to one or more of the identified employees **(modifications to the target market pay for individuals)** [Column 7, lines 12-13, 16-26,]; and

(d) revising **(making changes to)** incentive planning data **(computing suggested target market pay or modified pay levels)** corresponding to one or more of the identified employees in response to the determination [Column 7, lines 16-50].

Paizis does not explicitly teach:

(a) identifying one or more of the selected employees with a high contribution level and a high attrition risk:

Art Unit: 3623

However, Paizis teaches the display of employee rankings, which enables the user to identify users with certain characteristics such as high or level contribution levels and competency scores [Column 6, lines 23-24, Figures 5A, 5B, and 5C]. Furthermore, Paizis teaches the use of computer spreadsheets, enabling employees to be sorted according to contribution level, competency score, or combined score.

Walker teaches the analysis of attrition risk **{determining levels of employee commitment and intent to stay, embodied by placement into one of four employee groups}** for one or more of the employees **{survey results of employees pertaining to their commitment and loyalty to their employers and why they feel that way}** [Page 1 of the 1999 Walker U.S Report].

Paizis is directed towards considering employee worth in determining employee compensation (which impacts employee retention). Walker is directed towards an analogous art of studying employee relationships with their employer and its impact on loyalty and commitment (leading to employee retention); thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Paizis of Walker to combine employee data regarding contribution level and attrition risk, because it would enable the company to cluster employees into groups of similar flight risk and contribution levels, leading to the identification and "prioritizing" of employees who should be targeted for retention by being approached with an intent to modify their compensation package to increase the likelihood of

Art Unit: 3623

retention, loyalty, and commitment, since certain combinations of flight risk and contributions are more desirable than others (i.e., high contribution, high flight risk vs. low contribution, high flight risk, etc.), and because any increase in an employee's compensation package (to ensure retention) is still less costly than the cost incurred in training new hires, thereby enhancing the ability to integrate competency measures, contribution levels, and market distribution data into compensation decisions, which is a goal of Paizis [Column 2, lines 46-48].

Claims 8-20 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1-7 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

Furthermore, regarding claim 8, Paizis teaches an information handling system comprising:

- (a) one or more processors (**CPUs 632**) [Column 11, lines 10-12];
- (b) a memory (**memory devices which include a first primary storage device 634 that is typically RAM, and a second primary storage device 636 that is typically ROM**) accessible by the processors [Column 11, lines 12-35]; and
- (c) one or more nonvolatile storage devices (**mass memory device 638**) accessible by the processors [Column 11, lines 25-35].

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3623

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Choi whose telephone number is (571) 272 6971. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PC

October 10, 2006

C. Michelle Tarae
C. Michelle Tarae
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623